

Federal Scholarships

Author(s): John D. Millett

Source: *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 9 (Dec., 1957), pp. 469-480+515

Published by: Ohio State University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1978799>

Accessed: 23-10-2015 09:00 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Ohio State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Higher Education*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Journal of Higher Education

DECEMBER, 1957 II

Federal Scholarships

By JOHN D. MILLETT

*The Case against a General Federal Scholarship Program
for Colleges and Universities*

FOR more than ten years a great deal of national attention has been focused upon the possibility of a general scholarship program financed by the Federal Government to assist worthy young men and women to attend our colleges and universities. Many articles and pamphlets on the subject have been written.¹ Various bills to provide for such a program have been introduced in practically every Congress during this period. The proposal is discussed continually in gatherings of college and university administrators.

Perhaps the most important setback for the idea of a general Federal scholarship program was the refusal of the President's Committee on Education beyond the High School

to endorse the proposal. In its second report published in July, 1957, the President's Committee urged increased local, state, and private support of scholarship funds and then declared that "at the present time" the Federal Government should not "undertake to provide new scholarships" for undergraduate students.² The Committee went on to say that if, after further experience, existing efforts "to meet the requirements for effective scholarships" should prove inadequate, then it would favor a Federal program "as the only way to fill the gap."

The Committee gave no extensive statement of reasons for its position. It spoke primarily of the danger that a Federal scholarship program might tend to discourage or "dry up" present interest in the provision of

¹For a compilation of references see Elmer D. West, *Background for a National Scholarship Policy* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1956); cf. also Charles A. Quattlebaum, *Federal Aid to Students for Higher Education* (Committee Print, U. S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, June, 1956).

²The President's Committee on Education beyond the High School. *Second Report to the President*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957, p. 56.

scholarship assistance by means of alumni giving, corporation support, endowment gifts and bequests, church and voluntary group assistance, and even state programs. The Committee did urge an amendment of the Federal revenue laws to permit deductions or credits on income-tax returns by students or their parents for expenditures incurred in obtaining formal education beyond high school. It also recommended the development "of an experimental, federally sponsored 'work-study' program at institutions of higher learning."³ These proposals indicated that the Committee was aware of defects in the scholarship proposal even if these were not explicitly set forth.

The interest in the possibility of a Federal scholarship program has arisen from two interrelated factors: concern for the financial welfare of our colleges and universities and the discovery that a sizable proportion of our youth of college ability is not enrolled in institutions of higher education. In a time of existing and prospective shortages of educated talent in our nation, this wastage is costly to our material well-being and our national safety.

The financial difficulties of higher education are too well known to require elaboration here. Under the stress of rising income needs, our colleges and universities reluctantly have had steadily to increase their charges to students. American higher education has been dedicated to the proposition of equal opportunity for young people of talent "without regard to wealth, birth, or other accidental condition or circumstance," to use the words of Jefferson. Higher

charges mean greater difficulty for the student or his family in meeting the cost of a college education.

As tuition charges have been increased, many colleges and universities have set aside part of the income for student assistance. If all of the additional income were available for instructional purposes, then the financial situation of many institutions would be improved.

To be sure, as has often been pointed out, scholarship funds do not directly help the financial situation of a college or university. Funds for scholarships provide aid to the individual rather than aid to the institution. The college or university financially is assisted by scholarship awards only if one of two circumstances prevail. If the institution is using general income for its student scholarship program, separately financed scholarships will permit the recapture of this income for academic purposes. Second, if, as some corporations are doing, the scholarship award to an individual is accompanied by a grant to the general funds of the institution he attends, then the institution likewise benefits.

There is a third financial factor involved in a scholarship program. A great many persons in recent years have been advocating that the fee charges of a college or university should approximate the cost of the educational service provided.⁴ If our institutions of higher education were to be operated on the basis of charges to the student which equaled the cost of education, then a substantial nation-wide scholarship program

⁴For a recent expression of this point of view, the reader may refer to Herbert Solow, C. P., "Colleges Are Too Cheap," *Fortune*, LVI (September, 1957), p. 161.

³*Ibid.*

would be essential in order to provide many students the opportunity to attend college.

Some administrators of privately supported institutions in particular tend to favor a large scholarship program in the hope that they can charge students the full cost of the education provided. If a state government or the national government is to become a major factor in financing higher education in the United States, the problem immediately arises how to assist the privately sponsored institution. Outside of junior colleges and teachers' colleges, student enrollment in America is almost evenly divided between privately and publicly supported institutions of higher education. Various complexities of constitutional doctrine and administrative procedure would arise if governmental units were to undertake the direct financial subsidy of general educational activity by privately supported colleges and universities.

The large-scale veterans' educational benefit programs under the 1944 and the 1952 laws have provided an answer to these complexities. Instead of the government seeking to subsidize the institution, let the government support the student. The student is then free to select his own college or university. If the scholarship subsidy is substantial, and if colleges and universities are encouraged to charge fees approximating the cost of operation, then a large-scale government scholarship program can be beneficial financially to institutions of higher education.

The second factor which has aroused so much concern with a possible Federal scholarship program is the widespread concern today with short-

ages of educated talent. A number of studies since 1945 have revealed that a substantial number of young people of college ability do not now go to college. It has been estimated that, for the country as a whole, as many as one-half of all high-school graduates in the top 25 per cent of the eighteen-year-old age group in terms of ability do not now go on to college.⁵

The reasons for this waste have been well summarized in the report of the President's Committee on Education beyond the High School.⁶ Children of parents engaged in factory, farm, unskilled, and nonprofessional occupations are much less likely to go on to college than the children of parents who are engaged in professional and managerial occupations. Young women are less likely to go to college than young men. As the Committee put it: "Educational opportunities throughout the Nation are not always fully accessible to minority group members."⁷ Young people who live in areas distant from an institution of higher education are less likely to go to college than those living near a college or university. Finally, low-income families are less likely to send their children to college than families enjoying higher income. As of 1957, it has been estimated that 52 per cent of all family units in the United States had incomes under \$5,000 a year.

The United States can ill afford to have any sizable proportion of its

⁵Cf. especially Byron S. Hollinshead, *Who Should Go to College* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952); Dael Wolfe, *America's Resources of Specialized Talent: a Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954); and Ralph F. Berdie, *After High School—What?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954).

⁶*Second Report to the President*, pp. 42-45.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 44.

youth of talent unenrolled in college, whether the controlling factor be social status, accessibility, individual motivation, or economic circumstance. There are substantial shortages in many professions today. These shortages promise to become more acute in the next fifteen to twenty years. These shortages have been decried by political, military, professional, and educational leaders.

The question then arises whether scholarship assistance might not help to a considerable degree in persuading young people to go to college. The difficulty with this question is that no one really knows the extent to which financial limitations are the controlling factor in discouraging many youth of talent. Most recent studies agree that social status and individual motivation may have more influence than family financial circumstances in determining a young person's interest in a college education. At the same time, it is difficult to isolate any of these major factors; they tend in many instances to be closely interrelated.

Since financial condition is a major, if not sole, determinant for many young people, the belief has arisen that here at least is a factor which can be affected by definite action: the offer of scholarship assistance. Hence a number of persons argue today that the nation should make generous provision to help worthy young people in obtaining a college education.

THE arguments against a general Federal scholarship program are essentially twofold. One is educational, the other is political. Both arguments must be carefully considered before a final decision is made on such a vital matter.

At the outset it is desirable to understand two qualifications to the discussion which follows. We are not concerned here with certain programs of assistance to individuals which the Federal Government has adopted to date, such as veterans' educational benefits, National Science Foundation fellowships or grants for graduate education and research in scientific fields, international educational exchange, grants for graduate study and research in the health sciences, or educational assistance provided to members of the Armed Forces and even to civilian employees. All of these activities have served a useful purpose and are not under consideration here.

In the second place, nothing said here is intended to cast any doubt upon the desirability of scholarship programs generally, or upon the need of our colleges and universities for increased scholarship funds. The growth of scholarship resources provided for our institutions of higher education in recent years is an encouraging development. Nothing should slow this up. Moreover, the growing interest of business and industrial corporations in providing scholarship assistance to children of their employees and to others has been welcomed by college and university administrators. Our whole system of higher education needs, and needs now, more funds for aid to deserving students.

Educationally, the problem posed by a Federal scholarship program is the effect it may have upon the existing structure of higher education in this country. My own firm conviction is that a Federal scholarship program on any scale which may be reasonably expected in the next twenty

years will have a disastrous impact upon most publicly and most privately supported institutions of higher education. The benefit is apt to be confined to a certain group of students and a small number of privately supported and publicly supported colleges and universities, namely, certain privately supported colleges and universities mostly in the north-eastern section of the United States and four or five state universities in the Middle West.

In addition, a Federal scholarship program will drive all institutions of higher education to adopt from necessity the financial practice of charging student fees at approximately the level required to meet the cost of the educational service involved. Not only would this mean a substantial change in the philosophy of educational finance in this country, but also it would mean a substantial change in educational philosophy as well.

Already the presidents of a number of state universities and of privately supported institutions are beginning to worry about the impact of national scholarship programs supported by corporations and foundations. One such program, for example, is that of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, a nonprofit agency with headquarters in Illinois and operating with grants from business corporations and private foundations. These scholarship programs provide a direct grant to the student who is then free to select an institution of his choice which will admit him. The result to date has been to encourage students to seek admission to a few institutions of high prestige.

Educational administrators have been aware for years that scholarship funds tend to distribute students

among various educational institutions in a pattern somewhat different from that which might have resulted in the absence of such assistance. There has been little evidence to date that such scholarship funds have brought very many young people into higher education who would not have gone otherwise. Such experience as we have observed or analyzed thus far suggests that scholarship resources tend to influence where a student goes to college rather than to influence actual college attendance as such.

If a general Federal scholarship program were to be started, it would have to be on a sufficiently large scale to encourage a large number of young people not now going to college. It is questionable whether fifty thousand scholarships annually would do this; if the scholarships were awarded first upon the basis of ability and second on the basis of need, the chances are that they would be given in large measure to young people already going to college. It must be remembered that at the present time the number of students enrolling for the first time in institutions of higher education is around six hundred thousand. If we were to try to recruit another one hundred and fifty thousand to two hundred thousand students, the financial effort of the colleges and universities would have to be sizable indeed, far larger than the amount anyone has been willing to talk about thus far.

A Federal scholarship program, even if administered on a state basis, could not properly stipulate that the recipient should go only to an institution in the state where he or she then resided. The individual would have to be free to go anywhere in the United States. The result might

well be a concentration of scholarship recipients in a few particular institutions.

This result is objectionable to many colleges and universities for a very simple reason. If top academic talent is to be drained into a few institutions, the quality of the educational program in other institutions necessarily will suffer. No college or university, public or private, large or small, meagerly or generously supported, aspires to be a second-rate, low-grade educational institution. All desire to improve their academic status. All have ambitions for greater achievement in quality. It would be unfortunate if this were not so.

Some colleges and universities make faster progress than others in improving their academic standing. Some institutions must necessarily accommodate a wide variety of talent among their students. Some institutions are careless or indifferent with their best students. Some institutions find talent in unexpected persons, and sometimes these persons are encouraged to their best efforts because of the competition they encounter with other good students.

No college or university can hope to improve its academic standards or hold its best teachers without good students. Students do not realize the difference between poor and good performance judged in academic terms unless they observe the actual contrast at first hand. There is not a college or university which is not continuously seeking to attract better students.

These fears are by no means groundless. For example, out of 264 Freshmen applying for admission to Miami University in September, 1957, who stood in the top 5 per cent of

their high-school graduating class, 72 subsequently canceled their applications. In almost every instance the individual had received a scholarship from another institution. The point is not that Miami University lost 72 potentially first-rate students whom it would have liked to have had, but that scholarships transferred students from the university to which they had planned to go to another institution. These awards did not bring young people into higher education who otherwise would not have gone to college at all.

If this happens now, what would happen under a Federal scholarship program reaching fifty thousand Freshmen a year? The only kind of scholarship program acceptable to a majority of institutions of higher education would be one which provided resources to the college or university itself with which to help it in the search for talent. Any other arrangement on a fairly modest scale will result in a deterioration of educational quality in a large number of institutions.

The other educational concern with a Federal scholarship program is the danger of placing higher education on a student full-charge basis. There are two different ways of looking at higher education. One is to think of a college education as an opportunity for the individual to quicken his own intellectual capacities and to learn how to draw upon the wisdom of twenty-five hundred years in understanding himself, his fellow men, and the world of which he is a part. The second way to think of higher education is to regard it as preparation for gainful employment in a profession. Both points of view are partially correct. Trouble arises whenever

anyone begins to think of higher education exclusively in one or the other way. Today in particular there is an increasing danger that many persons will think of higher education solely in terms of its monetary advantage to the individual.

There are several reasons for this tendency. Today entrance into most professions is only through the avenue of a college education. College graduates prepare themselves for specific professional careers. Shortages of talent have resulted in substantial remuneration from professional practice. In consequence, the public is constantly being reminded that it pays to get a college education. In turn, businessmen familiar with the problem of meeting the cost of production or of service through charges to the consumer naturally ask, Why should higher education not be financed in the same way?

And it is true, as we have remarked, that the charges to individual students have been increasing. Even at the publicly supported college or university higher education is not free to the student in the same way that primary or secondary education is free. The fact that students pay a substantial part of their educational cost is another argument frequently heard in favor of having them pay all the cost. Furthermore, the fact that so many college students are the children of well-paid professional parents is another reason for suggesting that they should pay more for their educational opportunity.

Without considering the complexities of determining the educational cost which students should pay—and these complexities are real—we may observe that as scholarship resources grow, the pressure likewise mounts

to increase the charges to students. Increasingly we may expect that influential persons and groups will put forth the proposition that all college students should be charged the cost of their education and that society should confine its assistance to those students who cannot afford to meet these charges. On the face of it this seems so reasonable an argument that many will approve it. A large scholarship program would make the argument almost unassailable.

Here I am interested primarily in the educational objections to this proposal. I shall consider the political and administrative objections later. The relatively simple idea of charging all students the cost of their higher education has explosive educational implications for all our colleges and universities. In effect, the result is to declare that the only proper purpose of higher education is to prepare students to obtain remunerative employment in a profession. The idea that knowledge has an intrinsic value to the individual is abandoned. No longer, in the customary phrase of the educator, is a college education intended to help a person to live; it is only intended to help him make a living.

Higher education has long considered that it has had an objective to preserve, transmit, and advance the realm of man's knowledge simply because knowledge is good in and of itself, while ignorance is evil. To propose now that higher education shall think of itself solely in the utilitarian sense of helping persons to make money is to surrender one of the great values derived from the heritage of our Western culture. Maybe that value is no longer worth preserving; if so, many of us will then lose our

interest in higher education as we know it today, and our society will have lost a major resource for free men.

We provide almost all students today in our colleges and universities with some degree of subsidy, or if you please, of scholarship. That subsidy is represented by the amount of endowment income, of gifts for current operations, and of tax support provided each college or university. In a privately supported liberal-arts college this subsidy will usually be from one-fifth to one-third of the expenditures for educational and general purposes. In the instance of a state-supported university, this subsidy will be from one-half to three-quarters of the expenditures for educational and general purposes.

In this way institutions of higher education have helped all students who entered. Educationally, this arrangement has helped free the college or university from complete capitulation to student preferences alone in establishing course requirements and intellectual standards. Educationally, this arrangement has helped in providing a variety of sources of financial support and so has advanced the cause of academic freedom. Educationally, this arrangement has helped encourage young people of marginal ability or interest to try a college education; in some instances these young persons have subsequently become creditable, and occasionally even outstanding, graduates.

To improve the present arrangement for student recruitment, it would have to be assumed that a large-scale scholarship system would do a better job of motivating young people to go to college than does the

present partial subsidy system for all students. There is very little reason indeed to accept any such assumption.

In brief, then, a large-scale general Federal scholarship system is subject to these objections from an educational point of view. First, it might tend to encourage young people of highest ability to seek admission only to a few colleges and universities of high prestige, thus lowering the standards and aspirations of other institutions. Second, it would encourage the idea already spreading in many circles that the proper way to finance higher education is to charge the individual student the cost of his education. Acceptance of this idea might well entail the loss of important values which now constitute a part of higher education. It would also make institutions rely upon a single source of income with consequent dangers for their independence. Third, there is no assurance that a large scholarship program by the Federal Government would succeed in recruiting more young people into our colleges and universities than the present system of partial subsidy for all students.

Educationally, a large-scale Federal scholarship program could lead to sterile mediocrity for a substantial number of our present institutions of higher education. It is no wonder that educational administrators are alarmed by the prospect of such a development.

THERE are political as well as educational objections to a general Federal scholarship program. In our country we have inherited two vital political traditions. One we may describe as "liberal constitu-

tionalism.”⁸ The other is the concept of the general welfare. Both traditions were revolutionary in nature; both traditions have excited the imagination of man through many years of political experience.

Let us begin briefly with the idea that the purpose of government is the general welfare. Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence more than just the words “that all men are created equal” and “that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights,” among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The self-evident truths embodied in the Declaration included the proposition that governments were instituted among men to secure these rights and that it was the privilege of man to change his form of government when it became destructive of these rights. In the preamble to the Federal Constitution the idea was presented in simpler terms. One of the basic purposes of the new government was to promote the general welfare.

Americans hold that government can in positive ways take action for the benefit of society as a whole. Our political processes seek to determine the public interest and then to embody that interest in governmental policies and administrative programs. By way of contrast, we insist that it is not the purpose of government to benefit just a single segment or class of society. We recognize rather that government can be made to serve the interests of all men and women in a democratic society.

And in truth the political history

⁸The phrase is used by Frederick Watkins in his *The Political Tradition of the West: a Study in the Development of Modern Liberalism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, pp. 149-77).

of our nation is the story of problems and controversies in which government action has been sought in order to assist the nation in industrializing, in providing means of transportation and communication, in improving the economic status of agriculture, and more recently in promoting maximum production, employment, and purchasing power. Our system of government is not concerned solely with the conduct of foreign relations, the national defense, or the protection of public safety, health, and morals. Our system of government endeavors in a wide variety of ways to advance the general welfare in positive terms.

In the past thirty years public attention has tended especially to be focused upon the Federal Government. Ours is a national economy, and when the general welfare involves issues of money and banking, unemployment, inflation, and other such problems only action by the Federal Government can be effective. Moreover, as the expenses of the Government have expanded under the impact of depression, war, and postwar international tensions, it has been Federal taxation of individual and corporate income which has provided needed revenue on a large scale.

The result has been a disposition in some circles to believe that every troublesome problem of public policy should be resolved by the Federal Government. Some persons seem to believe that state and local governments have no funds to spend while the Federal Government has unlimited tax resources. Others appear to believe that it is easier politically to obtain federal legislation than state legislation to meet complex public issues.

This is happening today in so far as matters affecting higher education are concerned. No one questions that our colleges and universities face real difficulties, or that our national well-being is involved in the preparation of young people of talent for professional activities. Yet a good many people seem to believe that governmental action alone can meet these situations, and that governmental action in behalf of the general welfare necessarily means action by the Federal Government.

Here then is where the second vital political tradition of our country comes into operation. Liberal constitutionalism is based upon a dual foundation. One is that government shall not be all powerful in our society. Rather, governmental power shall be limited in scope and in procedure. A great deal of room for operation is left to individuals and to voluntary groups such as business partnerships and corporations, labor unions, religious bodies, social organizations, and welfare and philanthropic agencies. When governmental action is called into force, its rôle frequently is one of restraint only to the point of preventing one group from unduly hampering the freedom of association and action of other groups. Our governmental institutions operate through a separation into legislative, executive, and judicial organs of decision-making in order to prevent a tyranny over individuals or groups.

In addition, liberal constitutionalism in our country embodies the fundamental proposition of federalism whereby governmental power is divided between forty-eight constituent states and a central organization. Initially, the Federal Constitution

undertook to enumerate the subject-matter concerns for the exercise of Federal power; this listing has taken on additional meaning with amendment, judicial decision, and political usage. Yet throughout the years education has been thought of essentially as a state, not a federal, function.

To be sure, the Federal Government has engaged in a number of activities directly or indirectly related to education in general, and to higher education in particular. It is not necessary here to review these activities other than to note that they range from gathering statistics to lending funds with which to build dormitories and other student facilities. The Federal Government subsidizes only one instructional program: agricultural education including extension work.

THE political question which the proposal for a general scholarship program presents is whether the general welfare should be promoted by such a Federal activity or whether in our concern for liberal constitutionalism the activity should be rejected. In so far as the general welfare is concerned, certainly a program with potentially as many educational faults as the Federal scholarship proposal may well not serve the public interest.

Indeed, one of the political dangers of a Federal scholarship program is that it may discourage many individuals, businesses, and other groups from continuing their support of scholarships. Once the Federal Government began the public support of agricultural education, private colleges and universities were given a

new reason to avoid this particular activity. The extent of this support of research in the physical and biological sciences is now such that few others are much interested in providing such assistance. At least it will not be easy to build up institutional resources for student aid once the Federal Government assumes a substantial rôle in this particular field.

Furthermore, the argument that a Federal scholarship program will be advantageous to the general welfare must be argued in terms of alternative forms of action. For example, I believe that a Federal program of low-interest loans for college and university housing would be even more desirable, and much less costly over a long period to the Federal Government. I would rather see this form of subsidy because it would help lower the costs of college attendance for the resident student and still entail few adjustments in present operation for our existing colleges and universities.

The basic political argument, however, involves issues of liberal constitutionalism. I am concerned politically about the possibility of a Federal scholarship program because of the bureaucracy it would require and the central control it might foster. If such a large-scale program were authorized, presumably administration would fall upon state government. Each state would have to establish machinery for selecting worthy students and for determining their need for scholarship assistance. This could be a fairly sizable chore in some of the more populous states. More than this, it would entail an additional inquiry into the life and financial status of every family with

a potential beneficiary. Governmental scrutiny of family budgets and family circumstances for scholarship purposes could well result in further hostility on the part of some citizens toward government.

Moreover, this administrative testing of students and of investigating family finances could be expensive. It would add a further cost burden upon state government, and state governmental finances are precarious as it is. There is apparently no intention on the part of the Federal Government to subsidize the administrative burden, and thus just another cost would be added to a state budget to compete with present activities.

Furthermore, we know from experience that the Federal Government, if it is to provide the funds for payment of scholarship awards, will insist upon a considerable degree of supervision of state administrative activity in selecting scholarship recipients. This supervision may extend in course of time to the colleges which the recipients attend. We cannot expect the Federal Government to assume financial responsibility for an activity and not exercise some direct supervision over it.

To be sure, all bills in recent years touching upon education renounce any intention on the part of the Federal Government to control educational policy. Yet in experience, every program the Government now administers, whether a grant or loan program, entails some degree of administrative supervision over our institutions whether supported by private, state, or city funds. Sometimes it may be only a matter of how financial records are kept. Sometimes the supervision involves matters

of employment oaths, or investigation of personnel, or signs to be erected on a building project. The point is that control does enter in when funds become available, and we cannot properly expect any other development.

I am aware that the land-grant program, which is the longest continuing program of Federal financial assistance to higher education, has operated with a minimum of stress and strain. Two conditions seem to have contributed to this happy result. One is the small size of the program; the states have constantly provided more support to agricultural education, extension, and research than the Federal Government. The other is the close and effective organization of the land-grant institutions which has helped them successfully to resist Federal bureaucratic encroachment. Neither of these conditions would necessarily obtain in the event of a large-scale Federal scholarship program.

Federal control is politically undesirable for two basic reasons. It must inevitably be a centralizing influence in education. A central supervising office first wants statistics kept in a uniform fashion; then it wants financial records kept on a uniform basis; then it wants uniform administrative practices; and it may well end up wanting uniform educational policies. The result can only be a centralization foreign to the present diversity of higher education, a centralization hostile to experimentation, a centralization destructive of our doctrine of liberal constitutionalism. Second, Federal control may result in a weakening of private and state initiative in educational

affairs. This in turn can result only in the danger of limiting academic freedom. Surely, the recent threat of investigation by Congress into various educational institutions has not been so completely forgotten as to dull our sense of menace.

Freedom in society is a precarious attribute at best. Much of the social mobility, the freedom of choice, the civil rights which we now enjoy have been achieved as much by chance as by design. To be sure, man in Western culture has ever held freedom to be a precious possession. He has never been entirely sure how to attain it. We know that vigilance is the price of liberty, but more than this we know that a healthy pluralism of competing social groups—a diffusion of power within our society—is important to the maintenance of freedom.

Undoubtedly change is necessary in the relations of government to the individual as our numbers grow and as our technology becomes more and more complex. Undoubtedly the Federal Government must exercise a greater degree of responsibility in certain matters affecting the general welfare than ever before. But if we become indifferent to the preservation of freedom, indifferent to the doctrine of liberal constitutionalism, in this process, then surely we cannot hope to preserve the characteristics of a free society.

It is because of this concern with freedom in the midst of the complexities of modern society that some of us are opposed to a large-scale Federal scholarship program. We hold that the needs are not so desperate at this time as to warrant

[Continued on page 515]

A NEW BASIS OF SUPPORT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, *by Thad L. Hungate*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957. 66 pp. \$1.75.

This vigorous and novel statistical analysis has as its goals: to ascertain state levels of support; to compare state patterns of sources of support; to measure state effort to provide higher education; to assess the adequacy of effort of each state . . .; and to aid in developing objective bases for federal support (page 3).

This is a formidable assignment, and the interpretation of the data is not easy for one who is not a statistician. For the fiscal technicians to whom it is primarily addressed, however, this study should prove illuminating. I believe in what the author is here trying to do, but as a layman I must say that the findings do not greatly advance my grasp of the salient elements of the problem.

The author correctly suggests that "the reader who is interested only in general aspects of the problem will find appropriate material in Part One." This is correct, and the conclusion that some new bases have to be arrived at for the sufficient support of higher education is statistically re-enforced.

ORDWAY TEAD
*Member, Board of Higher Education
New York City*

Federal Scholarships

JOHN D. MILLETT

[Continued from page 480]

far-reaching changes in existing educational organization and operation which could threaten educational freedom.

IT IS one of the ironies of our day how words can be twisted into new meanings to suit current convenience. In educational circles it is not unusual to hear it said that the advocates of Federal financial support of higher education are liberals and the oppo-

nents are conservatives. In this definition a liberal is anyone who favors change. In the setting of higher education, a liberal appears to be one who favors Federal financial support over and above state financial support, endowment support, alumni and individual support, and student charges. A conservative is one who favors the present pattern of diversity and fears Federal support as a centralizing influence in the conduct of our institutions of higher education.

It is tempting to argue that the true liberal is one who favors freedom, and that those who fear Federal control of educational policy are more truly liberal than their friendly opponents. Let us accept the designation of conservative. In the educational scene conservatism is a badge of honor, since the first basic objective of education is to conserve for future generations the knowledge and wisdom of the past and present. Because a Federal scholarship program both in educational and in political terms might threaten that basic objective, educational administrators and others are deeply concerned. If this be conservatism, we must make the most of it.

[Vol. XXVIII, No. 9]

The Technical Institute

GORDON M. HARRINGTON

[Continued from page 488]

American higher education. Does the democratic principle of the right of everyone to have an education mean a right to compete or a right to receive? Are many to be called and few chosen? Alternatively, do we need to distinguish and to organize for two or more types of intermediate